

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed January 30, 2007. Claims 1-25 were pending in the application. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Claims 23-25 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 26-28 have been added. Applicant requests reconsideration of the claims and allowance of the application in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 3-22 were rejected as being anticipated by Bunte et al. (US 5,821,523) (hereinafter referred to as "Bunte"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests withdrawal of the claim rejections.

For reference, amended Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. An electronic screen display, comprising:
a screen;
a memory storing digital content for display on the screen;
a processor communicatively coupled to the memory and the screen, wherein the processor is configured to obtain digital content from the memory and to generate an action causing a primary display to appear on the screen; and
a sensor communicatively coupled to the processor, wherein the sensor is configured to activate only when detecting a certain light signal emitted from an external device, the light signal being used by the external device to read or assist in reading information from the primary display on the screen, and wherein, when activated by the light signal, the sensor is triggered to cause the processor to obtain further digital content from the

memory and to generate an action causing a secondary display to appear on the screen.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Bunte patent and finds no disclosure that anticipates the claimed invention. Bunte discloses an "image capture system" (i.e., a digital camera) that is capable of taking a picture of a static barcode printed on a product and decoding the barcode. The contrast between the system taught by Bunte and the present invention is apparent when considering embodiments of the invention described in the present application. For example, at page 3, lines 2-15, the present application states:

Embodiments of the present invention may be used to electronically display a symbol, such as a barcode or coded icon, on a thin electronic display and use the method of "reading" the barcode or coded icon on such a display to activate an integrated light-dependent sensor. In a preferred embodiment, the light-dependent sensor is activated by specific light for which the sensor has been calibrated. The sensor is not activated by general ambient light, but by light emitted from a "reader." In turn, the light-dependent sensor acts as a switch that, when activated, initiates a change in the electronic display. The barcode or coded icon on the display may be replaced with additional information or images, or new information or images can be added to the barcode or coded icon on the display. Other such images may include, for example, static or dynamic images (i.e., still or moving images). The information displayed on the electronic display could have a variety of functions, from entertainment to advertising to reporting critical data related to the product, like expiration dates.

While the image capture system taught by Bunte may have a processor, Bunte's system does not include "a sensor communicatively coupled to the processor, wherein the sensor is configured to activate only when detecting a certain light signal emitted from an external device, the light signal being used by the external device to read or assist in reading information from the primary display on the screen," as claimed. Additionally, Bunte's system does not have a sensor that "when activated by the light signal, the sensor is triggered to cause the processor to obtain further digital content from the memory and to generate an action causing a secondary display to appear on the screen," as claimed.

The Office Action refers to "reflected light from an illuminated object sensed by the photo-detector" in Bunte, but this light is ambient light; it is not "a certain light signal emitted from an external device [that is] being used by the external device to read or assist in reading information from the primary display on the screen." As noted with the particular embodiments described above, the sensor in the present application is not activated by general ambient light, but by light emitted from an external device, such as a reader. To the extent the Examiner equates the photo-detector in Bunte with the sensor in the present application, applicant points out that the photo-detector in Bunte receives and process all light it receives; it is not configured to be activated only by a certain light signal emitted from an external device, as claimed in the present application.

Accordingly, applicant submits that Bunte does not anticipate the subject matter of Claim 1, and that Claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 3-13 are also allowable, both for their dependence on Claim 1, and for the additional subject matter they recite. The photo-detector array 914 taught by Bunte is not "configured to activate only when sensing a predefined light signal," as recited in Claim 6. Rather, the photo-detector array 914 processes all light that it receives. See Col. 18, lines 33-43

of Bunte. Additionally, Bunte discloses nothing about a light signal that is defined by wavelength or by a pattern, as claimed in Claims 7 and 8. The Office Action (page 3) referred to "reflected light" but reflected light is any light that bounces off an object. "Reflected light" is not a predefined light signal, nor is defined by wavelength or by a pattern.

Furthermore, Claim 9 recites the electronic screen display of Claim 1, "wherein the sensor is disposed underneath the screen." There is no disclosure of this subject matter in Bunte, nor does the Office Action identify any portion of Bunte that teaches this subject matter. For the foregoing reasons, Claims 1 and 3-13 should be allowed.

Claims 14-22 should also be allowed. Bunte does not teach a method of displaying primary digital content on a screen and sensing a light signal from an external device, as claimed in Claim 14, wherein the light signal is being used to read or assist in reading information from the primary digital content displayed on the screen, and wherein the light signal is generated by the external device. Furthermore, Bunte does not teach a method of causing secondary digital content to appear on the screen in response to the sensing the light signal. Accordingly, Claim 14 should be allowed.

Claims 15-22 are also allowable, both for their dependence on Claim 14, and for the additional subject matter they recite. For example, Claims 21-22 present subject matter that is patentable over Bunte for reasons similar to the reasons discussed above relative to Claims 6-8.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 2 was rejected as being unpatentable over Bunte in view of Wang et al. (US 5,659,167) (hereinafter referred to as "Wang"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests withdrawal of the claim rejection. Claim 2 is dependent on Claim 1, and as such, incorporates all the elements of Claim 1. Claim 2 is thus patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Allowability of New Claims 26-28

New Claim 26 is similar to Claim 1, and is directed to a system that further includes the external device that "reads" the information shown on the display screen. Specifically, Claim 26 recites as follows:

26. An electronic screen display system, comprising:

a screen;

a memory storing digital content for display on the screen;

a processor communicatively coupled to the memory and the screen, wherein the processor is configured to obtain digital content from the memory and to generate an action causing a primary display to appear on the screen;

an external light-emitting device configured to generate and emit a light signal that is directed toward the screen to read or assist in reading information from the primary display on the screen; and

a sensor communicatively coupled to the processor, wherein the sensor is configured to activate when the sensor detects the emission of the light signal from the external light-emitting device,

wherein the sensor, when activated by the light signal, is triggered to cause the processor to obtain further digital content from the memory and to generate an action causing a secondary display to appear on the screen.

The arguments presented above relative to Claim 1 should also be considered relative to Claim 26. Where Bunte and Wang (individually and collectively) fail to teach or suggest "an

external light-emitting device" and "a sensor" as claimed in Claim 26, the invention set forth in Claim 26 is patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, Claim 26 should be allowed.

Claims 27 and 28 are also allowable, both for their dependence on Claim 26, and for the additional subject matter they recite. For example, Claim 27 is directed to the electronic screen display system of Claim 26, "wherein the primary display on the screen includes a symbology that is readable from the screen by the external light-emitting device and translatable into an identification of a product for automating a purchase of the product," which is not taught or suggested by Bunte or Wang. For its part, Claim 28 is directed to the electronic screen display system of Claim 26, "wherein detection of light emission from the external device by the sensor indicates a purchase of the product which causes the secondary display to appear on the screen." The subject matter of Claim 28 is also not taught or suggested by Bunte or Wang. Accordingly, Claims 26-28 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests further examination and allowance of Claims 1-22 and 26-28. Should any issues need resolution prior to allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned counsel by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Kevan L. Morgan
Registration No. 42,015
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

KLM:jvb

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100